

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the above-referenced patent application.

Applicant submitted a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 from Japanese patent application number 2002-190156 (filed June 28, 2002) on June 25, 2003, along with a certified copy of the foreign priority application. The Examiner has yet to acknowledge Applicant's filing. Applicant, once again, respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

The Examiner also has not objected to the drawings. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate acceptance of the drawings.

Applicant further requests that the Examiner consider the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on July 21, 2005 and August 9, 2005, and sign and return the corresponding PTO-1449 forms filed therewith.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,016,130 to Annamaa.

On November 21, 2005, the Examiner and Applicant's undersigned representative, Mr. Dexter Chang (Reg. No. 44,071), conducted a telephone interview to discuss the present application. Applicant and Mr. Chang thank the Examiner for his time and consideration for such an interview. During the interview, the Examiner agreed to correct the summary sheet for the August 30, 2005 Office Action to indicate the Examiner's original intention of designating the Office Action as a non-final Office Action. The Examiner and Mr. Chang also discussed the prior art rejections based on Annamaa.

Mr. Chang pointed out, and the Examiner agreed, that Annamaa does not disclose any opening parts on the antenna described therein.

Thus, the Examiner agreed that Annamaa fails to disclose or suggest

"a case for covering said elements having the coil shape, wherein: said case has one or plural opening parts within the range keeping the durability of the body of said case," as recited in base claims 1 and 7. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7, together with claims 2-5 and 8-11 dependent therefrom, respectively, are patentable over Annamaa for at least the foregoing reasons. And the Examiner agreed to withdraw the § 102 rejection of these claims. Claim 13 includes limitations similar those of claims 1 and 7 cited above and is, therefore, together with claims 14-16, and 18 dependent therefrom, patentable over Annamaa for at least the same reasons. The Examiner, likewise, agreed to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Claims 6, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annamaa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,734,831 to Makino. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relied upon Makino as a combining reference to specifically disclose additional features recited in dependent claims 6, 12, and 17; namely, "a case made of resin." As such, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Annamaa and Makino in the manner proposed by the Examiner at the time the claimed invention was made, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the above-cited features of base claims 1, 7, and 13—from which claims 6, 12, and 17 depend, respectively—that are absent from the disclosure of Annamaa. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claims 6, 12, and 17 are patentable over Annamaa and Makino, individually and in combination, for at least the same reasons as those stated above with respect to base claims 1, 7, and 13. The Examiner also agreed to withdraw the rejection of these claims.


The above statements on the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference that provide the basis for a view contrary to any of the above-stated opinions.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's implicit finding that the additional U.S. patents made of record, but not applied, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable, whether these references are considered alone or in combination with others.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dexter T. Chang  
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304  
Telephone: (212) 940-6384  
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987  
Docket No.: 100806-00211 (NECU 20.463)  
DTC:par